

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 are amended herein. Claim 2 is cancelled herein. Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added as a result of the Claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 11

The present office action states that Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Joseph Steinman and Greg Lowe's "Systems and methods for a latch assembly for use with a motherboard assembly having at least one daughter board", issued in September 2003 (hereinafter Steinman). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 are not anticipated by Steinman for the following rationale.

Regarding Independent Claims 1 and 11, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 and 11 herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 includes the currently amended feature:

"a first printed circuit board having a first portion of functionality, said first printed circuit board coupled to a pair of card guides;

a second printed circuit board having a second portion of functionality, said second printed circuit board coupled to said pair of card guides."

Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 6 lines 19-22 and 13 lines 5-7 and Figure 1A. (Claim 11 includes similar features.)

Applicants have reviewed Steinman and do not understand Steinman to anticipate the currently amended feature of first and second printed circuit boards being coupled to a single pair of card guides.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Steinman and as such, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable as they overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Regarding Independent Claims 1 and 11, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 and 11 herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 includes the currently amended feature “coupling said second printed circuit board with said first printed circuit board in a flexibly designed configuration to provide a functional multi-stage printed circuit board.” Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 14 lines 20-22 and Figure 1A. (Claim 11 includes similar features.)

Applicants have reviewed Steinman and do not understand Steinman to anticipate the currently amended feature of coupling the second printed circuit board with the first printed circuit board in a flexibly designed configuration to provide a functional multi-stage printed circuit board.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Steinman and as such, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable as they overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Regarding Independent Claims 1 and 11, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 and 11 herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 includes the currently amended feature “wherein said flexibly designed configuration enables replacement of either said first printed circuit board or said second printed circuit board from said pair of card guides without requiring the removal of the other of said first printed circuit board or said second printed circuit board from said pair of card guides.” Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 6 lines

22-26, page 12 lines 16-18 and page 13 lines 7-8. (Claim 11 includes similar features.)

Applicants have reviewed Steinman and do not understand Steinman to anticipate the currently amended feature wherein the flexibly designed configuration enables replacement of either the first printed circuit board or the second printed circuit board from the pair of card guides without requiring the removal of the other of the first printed circuit board or the second printed circuit board from the pair of card guides.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Steinman and as such, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable as they overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 2-6

Regarding Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 2 is canceled herein. Therefore the rejection with respect to Claim 2 is moot.

With respect to Claims 3-6, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 3-6 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 3-6 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Claims 12-20

With respect to Claims 12-20, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 12-20 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 11 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 12-20 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 9/20/06



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 938-9060